

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/015,353	12/11/2001	R. Terry K. Baker	1.902.16	8422
75	90 05/20/2004		EXAM	INER
HENRY E. NAYLOR			HENDRICKSON, STUART L	
KEAN, MILLER, HAWTHORNE, D'ARMOND MCCOWAN JAMANLL P.O. BOX 3513			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BATON ROUGE, LA 70821-3513			1754	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No. Applicant(s)
Office Assistance Commencer	18/615353
Office Action Summary	Examiner Group Art Unit
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears	on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address-
Period for Reply	•
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	EXPIRE MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE
from the mailing date of this communication.	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.  Spire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  Cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status	
A Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2/13/64	
This action is FINAL.	
<ul> <li>Since this application is in condition for allowance except to accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935</li> </ul>	r formal matters, <b>prosecution as to the merits is closed</b> in C.D. 1 1; 453 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims	
$\triangle$ Claim(s) 1,3-8, 10-14	is/are pending in the application.
Of the above claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideration
$\sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}$ Claim(s) $\sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}$	is/are allowed.
Claim(s) 8) (0) (3) 14	is/are rejected.
	is/are objected to.
□ Claim(s)	are subject to restriction or election requirement.
Application Papers	
☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing I	
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	
☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are objected ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.	to by the Examiner.
☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)	
☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority unde	35 U.S.C. & 11 9(a)-(d)
☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the	
☐ received.	
□ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number)	
☐ received in this national stage application from the Intern	•
*Certified copies not received:	•
Attachment(s)	
☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(	s) 🗆 Interview Summary, PTO-413
□ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892	☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948	□ Other
Office A	ction Summary
decrark Office	

Application/Control Number: 10/015,353

Art Unit: 1754

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 8, 10, 13, 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Moy et al. 6143689 in view of Rodriguez '951.

Moy teaches in column 6 and 11 making carbon nanotubes from CO and Fe on Mg. Moy does not exemplify using H2 and CO, but choosing them together is an obvious expedient to optimize fiber formation by suppressing graphite, as hydrogen is well known to do in nanotube synthesis.

Moy does not teach Co, however Rodriguez does as an equivalent to Fe in column 5, in a similar process. Using Co as a catalyst in the Moy process is an obvious expedient to gain its catalytic effect. When the Co is used, the claimed fibers are deemed to be formed.

Applicant's arguments filed 2/13/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The arguments as to Fe overlook the fact that the references make fibers, and are not concerned with the shape. Thus, one reading the references would be motivated to use Co for Fe, particularly noting the fact that when applicant filed the application, Fe was considered to be equivalent to Co.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 1754

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to examiner Hendrickson at telephone number 571-272-1351.

Stuart Hendrickson examiner Art Unit 1754